

SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

14th Year of Publication

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Volume XIV, Number 13

P.O. Box 6226A, Washington, D.C. 20015

August 15, 1984

Little Difference on that Narrow Issue

Reagan, the Democrats, and the Care of Science

Washington's care and feeding of the scientific professions—an inspiration for political activism in several recent presidential campaigns—seems to be stirring virtually no interest this year, the reason being that both parties have become so pro-science that they're indistinguishable on that score.

That may be why SGR's inquiries among the scientific war horses of previous campaigns have so far failed to reveal any political stirrings for 1984.

Campaign matters didn't come up at a recent meeting of the White House Science Council, we're told. Purists, of course, insist that partisan issues have no place there, but that hasn't kept the White House science-advisory apparatus out of some campaigns in the past. Inquiries on Capitol Hill and various other places produced nothing.

At Mondale-Ferraro national headquarters, the staff putting together "issues task forces" sounded puzzled

How the AAAS Board Opted for a Half-Time Editor for "Science"—Page 5

when asked whether science-related subjects might be included. The Democratic Platform (Page 3) contains a few passages about R&D, along with allegations of neglect of the nation's scientific enterprise by the Reagan Administration, and a plug for more support for "commercially rated R&D." That last point is intended as a slap at the Reagan Administration's emphasis on basic research, which has prospered while applied programs have been shut down. The platform also calls for a new program for science and engineering training, modeled after the land-grant system of agricultural education.

The Republicans have been going through the motions of gathering testimony on the federal role in science (Page 2), and their platform, not yet completed at this writing, is likely to trumpet the great increases that the Reagan Administration has produced for basic research, while downplaying the massacres of applied-research programs. But with no real contention between Democrats and Republicans over research-related matters, and no political mileage in the subject, the scientific community can sit happily on the sidelines, confident that whoever wins, generous budgets for R&D will continue to roll in.

In terms of dealing with the federal government's dominant role in science and technology, are there any substantial differences between the performance of the Reagan Administration and the Democratic style in those fields? The two overlap a great deal in concern over the financial well-being of basic research, particularly in universities. Taking the counsel of Presidential Science Adviser George A. Keyworth II, the Reagan Administration has provided a great deal of money for fundamental research in universities. It has been responsive to the needs of "big science," from high-energy physics to ground-based astronomy, and generally has followed a policy of telling scientists to get together to sort out their priorities and present them to the federal agencies. In most instances, the agencies have responded sympathetically, with the result that high-tech-

(Continued on page 3)

In Brief

NIH will go into fiscal 1985 with a healthy budget increase, but whether it will be just big or very big is yet to be worked out between the House and Senate. The White House asked for a trifling increase, \$105 million, in the current budget, which totals \$4.2 billion. The Senate voted for \$5.1 billion, while the House later came out with \$4.8 billion. The rescue effort was led by the usual disease lobbies as well as medical school chiefs warning of a dropoff in training and research under the Administration's budget.

Foreign undergraduate enrollments in US engineering schools rose over 5 percent last year, according to the Engineering Manpower Commission, to 25,000 out of a total enrollment of 406,000 undergrad engineers. At the graduate levels, the foreign students constitute a major portion of enrollments: 32 percent of the master's degree students and 41 percent of the PhD candidates.

Health physics is experiencing an employment boom because of "more stringent requirements" in the nuclear industry and among other users of nuclear materials, according to the Department of Energy. Between 1981 and 1983 employment of health physicists rose from 1840 to 3240. Total "nuclear-related employment" in all fields was placed at 288,700, an increase of 2.6 percent in that same period.

Stanford Head Urges GOP to Boost Science Funds

It would seem a daunting task to plead financial insufficiency and a looming crisis in science when the Reagan Administration and Congress have provided huge increases in research funding, science is booming, and most of the rest of the world is falling far behind. But it can be done—as was nimbly demonstrated July 30 when Donald Kennedy, President of Stanford University, testified to the Committee on the Republican Platform in behalf of the Association of American Universities and the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges. Excerpts follow:

I regret that much of what I have to say today is worrisome. In emphasizing what needs to be done, I do not want to ignore what has been done for fundamental research. The Administration must be commended for its general support of the physical sciences, especially in the budgets of the National Science Foundation, and in articulating the importance of a strong science base. We also recognize that many members of Congress . . .

Yet my major theme—which may come as a surprise to you—is that we are approaching a crisis in our ability to perform increasingly sophisticated and costly research and to train the next generation of scientists. How, one might ask, can a nation which just swept the Nobel research awards—a nation whose scientific supremacy is conceded everywhere—be in such a predicament?

“We are Undercapitalized”

The short answer is that we are undercapitalized. The great achievements of the moment we owe largely to the prudent investments of the past; but for too long we have not replenished that depleting scientific base. One can take little comfort in the successes that grow from the last bites of accumulated savings.

We have reached this unhappy state because, as a nation, we have temporarily lost sight of the distinction between operating and capital support. Thus, we have failed to commit ourselves to a continuing investment in the raw materials of research and education—the facilities, the equipment, the future brainpower. And unless

we make that commitment . . . a research enterprise that is unequalled in the world may soon court mediocrity . . .

For the past 15 years, the government's policy can fairly be described as an attempt to buy the product of an apparatus without continuing the investment to keep it working in top form. We have become all too familiar with that policy in this country: it was the governing strategy for most of American industry. We are paying the price for neglecting plant in our industrial sector, and we are just about to begin to do the same thing in research. Without the needed capital investment, research will continue to be performed—just as steel and autos continue to be produced—but its quality will diminish, making it less competitive in the world market. The deficiencies . . . are not the fault of this Administration, or the last, or the one before that. All of us have failed to see and correct the problem; it is an example of bipartisan neglect.

Proposes “Re-endowment” of Science

Accordingly, all of us ought to collaborate on the repairs . . . The years of inadequate capital have created serious needs in four areas: Research facilities, research instrumentation, graduate education, young faculty support . . .

We have constructed something truly extraordinary in the American scientific enterprise, one that is the envy of the world. It is running well, if one looks only at the operating side. But there is a yawning liability on the capital side.

What I have been talking to you about amounts to nothing less than the re-endowment of basic science in this country—a rebuilding of capacity aimed at the research facilities, the instrumentation, and the next generation of human resources in the nation's research universities.

If you believe that the two-thirds of the nation's basic research that is done in these places is essential to this society's innovative potential and growth—and I believe the evidence that it is is unmistakable—then you should adopt this re-endowment as a fundamental goal.

ISSN 0048-9581

© Science & Government Report, Inc., 1984

Editor and Publisher
Daniel S. Greenberg

Associate Publisher
Wanda J. Relf

Contributing Correspondents

François Segurier (Paris); Ros Herman (London)

Independently published by Science & Government Report, Inc., twice monthly, except once each in January, July & August. Annual subscription: Institutions, \$144.00 (two years, \$255.00). Information about bulk and individual rates upon request. Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St. N.W., Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. Second-class postage at Washington, D.C. Please address all subscription correspondence to Box 6226A, Northwest Station, Washington, DC 20015. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on Xerox University Microfilms. Claims for missing back issues will be filled without charge if made within six months of publication date.

... Defense the Big R&D Gainer under Reagan Policy

(Continued from page 1)

nology science is now embarking on a new federally financed building spree.

But it wasn't all that different under Jimmy Carter, who, while preaching the need for ironfisted government frugality, explicitly listed science as one of the few exceptions. During the four fiscal years that the Carter Administration wrote the federal budget, funds for basic research rose from \$3.7 to \$5 billion. Since then, the total has risen to \$7.2 billion, for the current fiscal year, with \$7.9 billion projected for next year.

The really big change that has occurred in R&D affairs under Reagan is a massive shift of money to the Department of Defense, most of it for big weapons development projects, but there's been an increase, too, in Defense support of academic research. When Reagan took office, a Carter-initiated increase in defense spending was already showing up in the R&D columns, so that the previous pattern of roughly an even balance between defense and non-defense R&D was changing in favor of defense. In 1976, each was budgeted for \$10.4 billion. By the end of the Carter Administration, defense R&D had risen to \$17.8 billion, while non-defense was at \$15.3 billion.

Since the Reagan Administration took office, the civilian figure has been about constant, ranging between \$14.3 billion in 1982 to \$15.9 billion proposed for next year. But in the period 1982-85, the budget proposed for defense R&D has soared from \$22.1 to \$35 billion.

The Administration's feat of getting more basic research out of a constant civilian R&D budget has been achieved through elimination of billions of dollars of applied, developmental, and demonstration projects. The Reaganites insist that the marketplace, rather than federal R&D agencies, should bring new technology to the American economy. Would the Democrats be any different on that score? Hard to say, since they were still in an inconclusive three-year muddle over the proper federal role in innovation when the 1980 election removed them from office. Among Congressional Democrats, there's no consensus on whether the government should be spending more on applied research, though there is strong support for an enlarged engineering program in the National Science Foundation.

For a time the Administration and Congressional Democrats were in sharp conflict over the federal role in science and math education, with the Democrats for a big one and Reagan's policymakers scornful of past efforts and opposed to new ones. But then science education became popularly associated with industrial prowess and job opportunities. Whereupon the Reaganites, with no visible embarrassment, turned around and supported an enlarged federal role in science and math

A Focus on Industrial R&D

The following excerpts are from the 1984 Democratic Party Platform:

•
We must encourage colleges and universities to train more scientists and engineers. More than 100 years ago, the Morrill Land Grant Act provided for agricultural colleges that today still help keep American agriculture the world leader. We need a similar program today to encourage the training of scientists and engineers

The United States should revise its downward trend and increase the percentage of GNP devoted to commercially rated R&D as a long-term spending goal As Democrats, our goal is to increase civilian research and development in this country, to expand its commercial application, and to provide more industries with the opportunity to take advantage of it.

At the national level, this means enhanced support for undergraduate and graduate training in science, mathematics, and engineering; increased support to refurbish and modernize university research laboratories; increased support for the National Science Foundation; and a commitment to civilian research and development.

In the past generation, scientists and engineers, together with educators and business leaders throughout the United States, have begun countless new high-technology businesses . . . to establish this country as a leader in the next generation of high-technology industries The Democratic Party will encourage and support centers that provide for cooperation of academic and entrepreneurial excellence, thereby strengthening our scientific and technological resources and creating tomorrow's jobs.

education. One of their first steps was to resurrect the science education directorate that they had not long before abolished at the National Science Foundation.

Where the ins and outs differ very sharply is on special government programs to encourage women and minority-group members to pursue careers in science and engineering. The Carter Administration had invested Presidential emphasis and a growing amount of money in those programs, particularly at NSF. Few remnants remain under Reagan.

Though the Administration has installed its ideologies in many key points in government, from the UN Ambassadorship to the first round of appointees at the Interior Department and the EPA, the science-support-

(Continued on page 4)

House Committee Plans 2-Year Science-Policy Study

The House Science and Technology Committee is making preparations for a two-year, bipartisan study of US science policy. Scheduled to start when the 99th Congress convenes in January, the study may be the biggest ever in the already crowded field of science-policy studies.

In preparation for the start, Committee Chairman Don Fuqua (D-Fla.), who will chair the study, has appointed a task force of 18 members drawn from the full Committee. According to an announcement, the task force will prepare an agenda for the study and begin the collection of background materials. Staff support will be headed by the Committee's Executive Director, Harold Hanson, and Committee staff member John Holmfeld, a veteran legislative specialist in science-policy affairs.

The announcement said that the issues to be studied include "the institutional framework for the support and conduct of scientific research; the training and education of young scientists; research funding methods; and the overall funding levels for science."

In anticipation of the question of why now and why so extensive a study, the announcement states that "the Committee is concerned that present policies and practices, many of which can be traced back to the famous 'Bush Report' of 1945, may not be fully adequate to the new environment facing US science in the coming decades."

To which might be added that the Science and Technology Committee and the Reagan Administration haven't got on too well on several key science-policy issues, though, by and large, both are committed to shelling out a lot of money for R&D. Nonetheless, the Committee would like to see even more spent on engineering research and training, science in the schools, supercomputers, and space research.

In addition, there's a feeling among many Committee members and staff that the White House Science Office lacks deference for a Congressional role in science-policy affairs. The feeling is not limited to the Reagan Administration. Jimmy Carter's Science Adviser, the mild-mannered Frank Press, collided with the Committee several times on the basic question of how seriously the White House took Congress on science-policy matters. The answer, of course, was not seriously at all, since a major portion of Congressional concern with things scientific arises from pork-barrel instincts, as Fuqua himself has recently demonstrated in bringing home the bacon for his academic constituents.

But, along with pursuing such down-to-earth matters, the members of the Science and Technology Committee have demonstrated a genuine interest in broader issues of science policy. The big study that's to get underway early next year appears to be of the high-road variety.

. . . Apolitical Choices for Science Agency Posts

(Continued from page 3)

ing agencies have been almost completely exempted from political considerations. Thus Reagan's first and second appointees to head the National Science Foundation, Edward Knapp and his incoming successor, Erich Bloch, were apolitical choices, as was the Administration's selection of James B. Wyngaarden to head NIH.

Edward Teller now finds a warm welcome at the White House, and has apparently been highly influential in selling "Star Wars" to the President. But the ongoing organizational device for bringing high-level scientific wisdom to the Presidency, the White House Science Council, is middle-of-the-roadish and non-ideological and has spent a lot of its time worrying about support of university science and the scientific and technical worthiness of the government's own laboratories.

A lot more industrial R&D executives are in high places in Washington under Reagan. Part of that reflects the national concern with industrial performance, but it also reflects the fact that Republicans and industry tend to go together. But it's difficult to establish that

they're doing anything about government R&D affairs markedly different from what likely Democratic appointees would do. National Academy of Sciences President Frank Press, White House Science Adviser under Jimmy Carter, has praised the Reagan Administration for shifting funds from applied to basic research. He's often said that the Administration is taking good care of the scientific enterprise.

On science and secrecy the Reagan Administration has put in a wavering and confusing performance and has got a lot of people worried and angry, though Keyworth now insists that the issue has been settled in favor of freedom of scientific communication (SGR Vol. XIV, No. 11). Whether the Democrats, ever eager to show they're not soft on the Red menace, would do any better is arguable. But what's common to both parties is that their scientists are generally opposed to restrictions on scientific communication. The Carter Administration never got its policy thinking untangled on this issue, so there's no way of knowing whether it was enroute to the mess that has occurred in the current

(Continued on page 5)

Ignoring Search Committee, AAAS Board Names Editor

There's little elation at the American Association for the Advancement of Science over the recent selection of the successor for Philip H. Abelson, who's retiring at the end of this year after 22 years as editor of *Science*.

The mood at the AAAS has nothing to do with the quality of Abelson's successor, Daniel E. Koshland Jr., Professor of Biochemistry at the University of California, Berkeley, who is well regarded as a researcher, administrator, and active citizen of the scientific community. Neither does the mood derive from sentiment for the departing Abelson, who many feel has overstayed his time after initially bringing the magazine into the modern age and making it the most important and influential scientific journal in the country.

Rather, there's dismay over the Board's decision to accept the Berkeley-based, 64-year-old Koshland as a half-time editor, rather than take a chance with any of the professionally less luminous but fulltime nominees presented to the Board by a search committee. Koshland said he will appoint a fulltime managing editor—a post that doesn't exist at present at the journal—but that announcement hasn't quelled the feeling that the Board has muddled into one of the more spectacular goofs in modern AAAS history.

That feeling isn't soothed by reminders that Abelson held a major job outside of *Science* from the time of his appointment in 1962 until 1979. During that period he was Director of the Carnegie Institution of Washington Geophysical Laboratory and then President of Carnegie, positions involving heavy responsibilities. But, unlike his successor, Abelson was based in the home city of the magazine. Furthermore, *Science* today is a far bigger and more complex operation than it was during most of his reign.

Election (Continued from page 4)

Administration. But this is one issue on which ideologies outside the scientific community can directly affect professional interests—and it's the Republicans who field the nastier ideologies.

Would the care and feeding of science be better attended to by a Republican or Democratic Administration? To that very narrow question, the answer is that science has been elevated above the political fray. Both political camps are keen for it, and both would keep the budgets high and promote favorable conditions for science's relations with government.

However, on other issues traditionally of concern to sensible scientists—including arms control, the environment, educational opportunity, and economic equity—the Reagan Administration has compiled an appalling record, one that far outweighs its good works in behalf of science.—DSG

One senior statesman of science long active in AAAS affairs remarked to SGR of the Koshland appointment, "I think it will be a disaster" for *Science*. His comment was related solely to the part-time issue, and he said he found it difficult to believe that the AAAS Board apparently felt that a weekly journal with the scope and scale of *Science* could be run on a halftime basis by someone heavily engaged in a professional career on the other side of the country. The half-dozen or so AAAS staff members that SGR spoke to are similarly gloomy about the appointment.

Why did the AAAS Board, which is laden with high achievers experienced in bureaucratic affairs, opt for a choice who wasn't even among the four nominees presented by the search committee? The answer, we're told by several who know, is that the seven-member search committee, chaired by Frederick Mosteller, of the Harvard School of Public Health, was unable to come up with any willing candidate who matched a bedrock criterion of the AAAS Board: scientific distinction, manifested in prizes or, preferably, by membership in the National Academy of Sciences. The retiring Chairman of the AAAS Board is Anna J. Harrison, Director of Carr Laboratories at Mt. Holyoke College; David Hamburg, head of the Carnegie Corporation, is President, and Gerald Piel, recently retired as publisher of *Scientific American*, is President-elect.

After months of searching and discussions with various possible choices, the search committee presented the Board a list of four candidates, rather than the three it was originally requested to produce. Two were described to SGR as "having good technical qualifications, though they are relatively unknown in the scientific community," and two possessed predominantly journalistic and editorial backgrounds. Why so few in this big country?

That's hard to say, but apparently the field was narrowed by the Board's reverence for membership in the Academy, which, curiously enough, includes among its 1450 members, only two of the AAAS' 13-member Board—Robert Berliner and Lawrence Bogorad. The Academy's membership rolls might seem to present a promising field for rustling up a science editor, but after you subtract the inert, the inappropriate and the uninterested, the residue is tiny. The salary for the *Science* editorship, reported to be in the range of \$100,000 to \$125,000, stacks up reasonably well with the high-flying end of the academic scale, and was not regarded as a discouragement for sought-after prospects.

Why not look abroad or to foreigners in the US, categories that offered some attractive possibilities that blend scientific and editorial experience? There was no

(Continued on page 6)

... Determined that Editor Has a "Big Reputation"

(Continued from page 5)

good reason not to. But the Board chauvinistically chose to confine itself to homegrown candidates.

Commenting on the group that was finally proposed to the Board by the search committee, one AAAS insider told SGR, "None of them had big reputations, no big prizes, and none were in the Academy." It was added that "the search committee had trouble finding anyone with a [scientific] reputation who would take the job."

Koshland, an Academy member since 1966, was among those whom the search committee had considered and rated highly, but his name was dropped when he insisted that he would be available only on a half-time basis. It was brought back into consideration at the suggestion of Executive Officer William Carey, the top hired hand at the AAAS, when the Board dismissed the search committee's field of four as unsuitable. Carey is reported to have said that since Koshland had been so highly rated as a fulltime prospect, it might be better to have a distinguished half-a-Koshland than a fulltime lesser figure. Carey, who's there fulltime while the Board members commute in for quarterly meetings, has a lot of influence in AAAS affairs. He, too, is soon due to retire, and has said that he regards the Abelson succession as his most important task before leaving office.

Koshland has said that he will reduce his academic and various other commitments to provide time for *Science*. And he has made the customary reassuring statements about "not tampering with a well-running machine," while trying to "make it even more influen-

tial than it is now," as reported in *Chemical & Engineering News*. Courtesy dictates such commentary, but the essential fact is that over the past five years, *Science* has been sinking in the esteem of the scientific community and increasingly falling behind its British counterpart, *Nature*.

Nature, with a circulation of only 20,000 compared to *Science*'s 155,000, has led the way with publication of the leading papers in recombinant DNA research and related fields, and its news section takes a world view of science policy, which it reports through fulltime correspondents in Washington, Tokyo, and western Europe, plus a worldwide network of part-timers. *Science*, with a characteristically narrow American view of research, has one three-quarter-time correspondent in western Europe and none elsewhere. The journal rarely, if ever, reports news from Eastern Europe, the USSR, or Asia.

The forecasts of great difficulty, let alone disaster, under a part-time editorship are almost surely overblown, since the magazine possesses a great deal of day-to-day administrative momentum, remains an attractive place to publish, advertise and politick, and is economically insulated by virtue of being the AAAS's most valuable property.

Science will survive and even prosper. But the odds for excellence are not enhanced by the Board's dubious choice of a part-timer, as meritorious as he may be. Obsessed by the false star of professional glitter, the AAAS Board did what boards often do: Settled for a foolish compromise.—DSG

New Head Named for IIASA Lab, a Leftover of Detente

Thomas H. Lee, Director of the MIT Laboratory for Electromagnetic and Electronic Systems, has been appointed Director of the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA), a Vienna-based vestige of detente which has been struggling on despite a fund cutoff by the Reagan Administration. He succeeds Professor C. S. Holling, who is returning to the University of British Columbia upon completion of the customary three-year term.

Created in 1972 in the glow of the Nixon-Brezhnev accords, IIASA is one of the few institutions where fulltime Soviet and American staff members work side by side. It thus naturally drew the suspicions of the Reaganite kooks, who promptly cut off the annual US contribution, \$2.2 million at that point. As a result, the manager of the US role in IIASA, the threadbare National Academy of Sciences, dropped out and was replaced by the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, which has been gathering funds from foundations and other non-governmental sources.

Lee's appointment was by unanimous vote of the IIASA Council, which is chaired by one of the Soviet Union's premier science politicians, Gherman Gvishiani, a power on the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology and still in there long after the demise of his father-in-law, the late Premier Kosygin.

Created to apply computer-based systems analysis to world resource problems, IIASA has always been regarded by American hardliners as an easy mark for Soviet voyeurs of western computer technology. Nonetheless, it has had the strong support of influential American technocrats, many of whom regard it as useful in itself, as a rare window on Soviet computer technology, and as a meeting ground with Soviet counterparts in a period when few of the old forums remain.

In addition to his position at MIT, Lee has had a long association with GE in both business planning and technological activities. He assumes the IIASA directorship on September 1.

Commentary: Reagan the Environmentalist

The President's election-year devotion to environmental purity is reminiscent of the pyromaniac who sets the fire, sounds the alarm, fights the blaze, and seeks credit for a job well done.

Mr. Reagan and his campaign handlers have long exploited the shortness of public memory in our fast-paced and cacophonous society. But an amnesia epidemic would be required to blot out recall of the deliberate havoc that this Administration has inflicted in this field.

Upon taking office, the Administration not only installed a wrecking crew in the top levels of the Environmental Protection Agency, but also cut the guts out of EPA's budget. A particularly destructive effort was focused on EPA's research programs, because they provide the scientific data on which the agency sounds alarms and bases cleanup priorities.

The numbers tell the story. In 1981, EPA was budgeted for \$385 million for research. The fiscal 1985 budget request—which is supposed to reflect the Administration's new commitment to a clean environment—is for \$278 million. With the inflation factor counted in, EPA now performs about one-third less research than it did four years ago.

All was supposed to be set straight by the ouster last year of the scandal-ridden leadership that the Administration originally appointed to run EPA. But the cleanup act that was expected from the new chief, William D. Ruckelshaus, has been slow in coming. No one doubts Ruckelshaus' sincerity or integrity. The failing is that the Administration is holding him and his agency on a very short leash, both financially and politically.

The most telling evidence concerns acid rain, a great deal of which originates in sulfur dioxide emissions from mid-western coal-burning plants.

With its attention focused on the polluters' political muscle, rather than on injured lakes and forests in the northeast and Canada, the Administration rejected Ruckelshaus' proposal for action on acid rain. Instead, it has proposed more research. More may be useful, because some important unknowns remain, but the Congressional Office of Technology Assess-

ment (OTA) recently concluded that there's no assurance that another five to 10 years of research will really improve scientific understanding of lake and forest acidification. Meanwhile, as OTA pointed out, important corrective measures—such as use of cleaner coal and smokestack scrubbers—are available now, but are little used by the suspect plants.

The one quality for which Mr. Reagan can never be faulted is loyalty to those who have served him well. He has demonstrated that many times, often to his political loss, as is the case, for example, with such old and seamy cronies as White House Counselor Ed Meese and CIA Director William Casey. He demonstrated it again recently with a symbolic resurrection of Anne M. Burford, who resigned in disgrace as the first head of the EPA in his Administration.

Just the day before Mr. Reagan was to profess his environmental ardor at a luncheon with a small group of environmental leaders, word came out that Mrs. Burford had been appointed to chair a government advisory committee on oceans and atmosphere.

The symbolism was touching. Mrs. Burford, after all, was only performing loyally for President Reagan when she trashed the government agency responsible for protecting the environment. Political necessity dictated her departure, along with a score of other tainted officials at the EPA. But in the President's view, that doesn't mean she isn't fit to resume responsibilities in the environmental field. With the same touch of class that she brought to her EPA post, Mrs. Burford later declined the advisory appointment, describing it as a "nothingbuger."

Embarrassed by protests against her appointment, Administration officials have conceded that a mistake was made. But in their view, the error was in timing. It was unwise, they felt, to announce her appointment so close to the President's peacemaking meeting with the environmentalists.

Mrs. Burford is now gone from the official Washington scene. Nonetheless, one gets the idea that she really is Ronald Reagan's kind of environmentalist—the kind for whom there would be a bright future in a second Reagan Administration.—DSG

COSSA Names New Director

David Jenness, a neuropsychologist, has been named Executive Director of the Consortium of Social Science Associations (COSSA), the Washington-based lobby for the social and behavioral sciences and various of their scholarly and professional organizational kin. He succeeds Roberta Balstad Miller, who, having put

COSSA on the map, has been hired away to head the Division of Social and Economic Science at the National Science Foundation, a major bankroll for research in those fields.

Jenness formerly served as President of a research organization concerned with music, the Kodaly Institute, and was an Executive Associate of the Social Science Research Council.

Rumor Mill Grinds as New NSF Head Gets Acquainted

Like any serious incoming agency chief, Erich Bloch, the newly appointed Director of the National Science Foundation, has been familiarizing himself with the \$1.5-billion agency, prior to taking office on a fulltime basis September 4 (SGR Vol. XIV, No. 12). But without doing anything but listening to a series of daylong briefings on his new charge, and asking questions about priorities and budgets, Bloch has inspired rumors of impending budget upheavals, staff reductions, and other disruptions in NSF's generally placid existence.

Fresh from 32 years at IBM and a vice presidency there, Bloch was bound to stir anxieties, simply because he's the first industrialist to head NSF. But as far as SGR can determine, the anxieties have no basis in anything he has said or done about NSF or in his record back at IBM, where he was Vice President for Technical Personnel Development.

According to an NSF senior staff member present for some of the briefings that Bloch received recently from NSF's assistant directors and program heads, Bloch did a lot of listening and little talking. Prominent among the matters he did inquire about was the concept of long-range planning. Bloch wanted to know how the NSF officials define it and what they're doing about it. "Most people felt it was a pleasant experience," SGR's source said of the briefings.

Bloch holds a recess appointment for the remainder of this Congress. Not yet having been sworn in, he's not yet officially the Director of NSF. That's something that will have to be attended to before he takes over next month. For serving beyond the end of the 98th Congress, he will have to be confirmed by the Senate.

Since NSF has fared poorly in having its directors stay on for the six-year term that the founding fathers deemed essential to the agency's independence, there's keen interest in Bloch prospects. (He succeeds Edward

SURA Gets Re-Reviewed

At the request of Congress, another review is being made of the biggest pending plum in nuclear-research facilities, the \$225-million Continuous Electron Beam Facility, which is otherwise all but cleared for construction at Newport News, Virginia, under the auspices of the Southeastern Universities Research Association (SURA).

To the relief of the promoters, the Congressional request was accompanied by an expected \$3.5 million to carry on with R&D for the project. Sources at the billpaying Department of Energy interpret that as a sign that the SURA venture is on the way to full clearance.

The review, aimed at assuring Congress that new technology has not leapfrogged the project since it was endorsed in 1982 by a joint DOE-NSF Nuclear Science Advisory Committee, is being conducted by a group headed by Eric Vogt, a nuclear theoretician at the University of British Columbia. DOE says it expects the Vogt study will be completed soon, and doubts there will be a delay in starting on the 5-year construction process.

Knapp, who lasted 18 months, following John Slaughter, who put in two years.)

One view in NSF coffee-break speculation is that at age 59, Bloch is not bucking for a university or industrial presidency, and therefore might stay the course. But there's not yet a glimmer of how he will get on with Washington, which is new territory for him.

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

Second class postage paid
at Washington, D.C.

XEROX-UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS
300 N. ZEEB RD.
ANN ARBOR, MI 48106

